

**PORT OF SEATTLE**  
**King County, Washington**  
**January 1, 1993 Through December 31, 1993**

---

**Schedule Of Findings**

---

All findings relate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Airport Improvement Program (AIP), CFDA 20.106

1. The Port Should File Construction Progress And Inspection Reports In A Complete And Accurate Manner

The Progress and Inspection Report (Form 5370-1) for Work Order C2980 under AIP 3-53-0062-33 for the week ended May 14, 1993, omitted the contractor name and project description. On Work Order C2608 for AIP 3-53-0062-27 the progress and inspection report for the week ended January 9, 1993, incorrectly reported a percentage of completion.

Out of an estimated population of 73 reports filed in 1993, a random sample of 25 were tested.

The general requirements state that reported information must be complete and accurate. These reports are required by 49 CFR 18.40(c) and 18.41.

We recommend the port strengthen controls over the completion and filing of the Construction Progress and Inspection Reports to ensure that the reports are filed in a complete and accurate manner.

2. The Port Should Follow Its Prescribed Consultant Contracting Procedures

Insufficient evidence existed in the Port of Seattle's files to document that the port's consultant contract selection procedures were followed for all consultants contracted for in 1993.

We reviewed 25 out of 160 applicable consultant contracts awarded in 1993. For one of these contracts we could not find the selection process sufficiently documented.

"Common Rule," Section 36(b)(1) requires that:

Grantees and subgrantees will use their own procurement procedures which reflect applicable state and local laws and regulations, provided that the procurements conform to applicable federal law and the standards identified in this section

Further, "Common Rule," Section 36(b)(9) requires that:

Grantees and subgrantees will maintain records sufficient to detail the significant history of a procurement.

This results in a questioned cost of \$5,304, the amount of the contract.

We recommend the port follow its qualifications based consultant selection procedures and maintain adequate evidence of such in the port's files.

3. The Port Should Ensure That Contracts On The Noise Remedy Program Include A Provision Prohibiting The Purchase Of Steel And Manufactured Products Produced Outside Of The U.S.

Prior to October 1, 1993, agreements between the port and noise remedy contractors did not include a provision prohibiting the purchase of steel and manufactured products produced outside the U.S.

Failure to include this provision in the contracts is in conflict with the special conditions of the grant agreement, however, interviews of these contractors did not reveal any noncompliance.

The manager of the noise remedy project was unaware that this requirement was applicable to this program.

We recommend the port strengthen controls related to the determination of applicable grant requirements.

4. The Port Should Obtain Signed Receipts From All Potential Displaced Persons Acknowledging That They Have Received A Copy Of The Agency's Relocation Program

On one parcel it was noted that the "Offer of Assistance and Brochure Receipt" acknowledging receipt of this information was not received from the owner.

This appears to have occurred because port staff did not follow up on this requirement when an out of state owner did not mail back the receipt.

The *General Relocation Requirements*, Section 24.203 requires that:

As soon as feasible a person scheduled to be displaced shall be furnished with a general written description of the displacing agency's relocation program.

We recommend that prior to release of funds the port ensure that all required documents have been signed. A potential follow up could have included withholding the distribution of funds and or obtaining the signature at the time of final closing and signing of papers, or sending the brochure to the owner via registered mail, return receipt requested.

5. The Port Should Prepare Accurate Federal Reports

Quarterly reports showing to-date gross disbursements and previous gross disbursements for AIP 3-53-0062-22 and 24 were incorrectly reported.

This apparently occurred due to a lack of a review process of quarterly and federal financial reports prior to their being filed.

This resulted in to-date and previous gross disbursements being underreported by a net amount of \$49,097.

The general requirements state that reported information must be complete and accurate.

We recommend the port issue corrected SF-272 reports to reflect actual activity. We further recommend the establishment of a review process of quarterly grant and federal reports for completeness and accuracy prior to their being filed.